

Appl. No. 09/928,680  
Amdt. Dated July 28, 2005  
Response to Final Office Action of April 26, 2005

### REMARKS

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter in Claims 1 – 7 and 16. Without conceding the propriety of the Examiner's position, and solely to expedite prosecution, claim 14 has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer

In regard to Examiner's rejection of claim 17, Applicants submit that the Sakashita reference (U.S. Patent No. 4,466,019) fails to teach or suggest what the Examiner has imbued the reference with teaching. More specifically, in the last Office Action, Examiner stated that the Sakashita reference discloses "a plurality of positioning recesses 7 formed at the first part [and] a plurality of positioning protrusions 15 that are formed at the second part." (See Figure 2 of the Sakashita reference).

Applicants respectfully refute Examiner's characterization of this prior art reference. Sakashita is directed to providing a lens apparatus having a provision for internal electrical connection between the lens and the camera body. (See Column 1, lines 30 – 33). Accordingly, electrical contact terminals 7 and 15 are provided respectively on the lens and the camera body to facilitate electrical contact. Accordingly, these elements are not positioning protrusions / recesses as claimed. Rather, as taught in Figure 2 and Column 2, lines 61 – 65, the lens and camera body each contain only a single positioning protrusion / recess 6a / 13a. The contact terminals 7 and 15 cannot possibly correspond to the claimed positioning protrusions and recesses for this reason alone. Furthermore, the terminals 7 and 15 are not selectively engageable but rather are connected to each other and are mutually fixed in order to provide the appropriate electrical connection. The cited structure therefore

Appl. No. 09/928,680  
Amdt. Dated July 28, 2005  
Response to Final Office Action of April 26, 2005

cannot possibly correspond to applicants claimed structure in this rejection is therefore improper.

In light of the foregoing at least for this reason alone, Applicants respectfully request Examiner withdraw his rejection of claim 17 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) and place this claim in condition for allowance.

Yet another independent deficiency of the Examiner's rejection is that the portion 14 can only be fitted into the portion 11. The elements 11 and 14 in the cited reference are not threaded and cannot possibly be considered the claimed first and second threaded portions as asserted by the Examiner. Each of these independent grounds confirm the impropriety of the Examiner's rejection. Moreover, the cited reference, when considered in light of any of the other remaining references of record, fail to teach or suggest the presently claimed invention.

Accordingly, in light of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of all remaining claims.

Date:

7/28/05

Respectfully submitted,

(Reg. #37,607)

Robert J. Depke  
**TREXLER, BUSHNELL, GIANGIORGI**  
**BLACKSTONE & MARR, LTD.**  
105 W. Adams Street, 36<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Chicago, Illinois 60603  
Tel: (312) 704-1890  
Attorney for Applicants